

REMARKS

Claims 1, 15, 18, 22, and 36 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 14, 16, 17, 35, 37, and 38 have been cancelled. Claims 1-13, 15, 18-34, 36, and 39-47 remain pending.

Claim Objections

The Examiner has objected to claims 15, 17, 36, and 38 as depending on a claim which has been canceled. In response, Applicant has amended the claims so that claims 15 and 17 now depend upon claim 1 and claims 36 and 38 now depend upon claim 22. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner withdraw the objection.

35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3-5, 7-13, 15, 17-22, 24-27, 29-34, 36, 38-43, 46, 47 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori (U.S. 6,167,565) in view of Moore et al. (U.S. 6,408,342; hereinafter "Moore"). The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 44, and 45 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori in view of Moore in further view of Vargas (U.S. Pub. 2004/0103405). The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 23, and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanamori in view of Moore in further view of Beisiegel et al. (U.S. Pub 2004/0177360; hereinafter "Beisiegel"). These rejections are respectfully traversed below.

Claim 1

As amended, claim 1 recites ... "the module for selecting the appropriate translator is configured to perform at least a two-level lookup in the translation mapping to select the

appropriate translator, wherein a first level of the two-level lookup includes a lookup of an inheritance hierarchy of the actual type to select the appropriate translator and, wherein a second level lookup of the two-level lookup includes a lookup based on formal data type of the second application.” Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references do not describe, disclose, teach or suggest the limitation recited above.

For example, Moore discloses a communication framework supporting multiple communications protocols that “allows an application program executing on one process to make method calls on objects located in other processes and yet be entirely oblivious to the communication protocol used to deliver data between the two processes.” See summary. Claim 9 states “the implementation of the interface of the Outstream class recognizes a composite data type object derived from a composite data type base class, and wherein each remote procedure call transport invokes selectively the at least one transport independent marshaler to marshal any composite data type object.” In the telephonic interview, the Examiner asserted that when an object is derived from a base class in Object Oriented Programming, an inference may be made that there is a two level lookup where the first level includes a check with the base class and the second level is a check with the inheritance hierarchy. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Even assuming that the Examiner is correct in his assertions, Moore still does not teach the limitation above because Moore does not teach the inheritance hierarchy as being the first level lookup.

Kanamori also does not specifically disclose the limitation discussed above. The Examiner states in page 4 of the Office Action that Kanamori does not specifically disclose “wherein the module for selecting the appropriate translator is configured to perform at least a two-level lookup in the translation mapping to select the appropriate translator, wherein at least one level of the two-level lookup includes a lookup of an inheritance hierarchy of the actual type

to select the appropriate translator.” Since claim 1 as currently amended is narrower than that stated by the Examiner, it is respectfully submitted that Kanamori also does not describe, disclose, teach, or suggest the limitation recited above.

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 22

For at least the foregoing reasons set forth in association with claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 22 is patentable over the cited references. Therefore, withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection in connection with this claim is respectfully requested

Dependent claims 2-13, 15, 18-21, 23-34, 36, and 39-47

Claims 2-13, 15, 18-21, 23-34, 36, and 39-47 depend on independent claims 1 and 22. Dependent claims recite additional limitations that further limit the independent claims. As such, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-13, 15, 18-21, 23-34, 36, and 39-47 are allowable for at least the same reasons as set forth above.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven Chang', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Steven Chang
Reg. No. 59,424

KOKKA & BACKUS, PC
200 Page Mill Road, Suite 103
Palo Alto, CA 94306-2022
Tel: (650) 566-9921
Fax: (650) 566-9922